IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.K.DENESAN
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.K.BASHEER

TUESDAY, THE 10TH APRIL 2007 / 20TH CHAITHRA 1929

RP.No. 33 of 2007(R)

AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT IN OP.20104/1997 Dated 04/12/2006
.....

REVIEW PETITIONERS/PETITIOENRS 2 TO 12 IN OP
---

1. T.K.SASI, S/O.K.K.THANKAPPAN,
KOCHUKULATHIL HOUSE, KOMARAKOM NORTH, KOTTAYAM.

2. A.K.KALADHARAN, S/O.P.K.AMBUJAKSHAN,
MATTATHIL HOUSE, KUMARAKOM NORTH, KOTTAYAM.

3. SIYAD K.H., S/O.K.P.HASSAN,
KARUKAPPARAMBIL, VIRUPPUKALA, CHEEPUMKAL P.O.

4. ANIL KUMAR K.C., S/O.T.S.CHANDRASAGURAN,
KOLLACHERIL, KUMARAKOM NORTH.

5. GEORGEKUTTY T.R., S/O.ROCKEY,
THAZHACHAYIL, WARD III, KUMARAKOM NORTH.

6. K.T.REJIMON, S/O.THANKAPPAN,
KARUKAPPARAMBIL, CHEEPUKMAL P.O., KAREEMADOM.

7. SANTHOSHKUMAR V.T., S/O.V.P.THAMPI,
VAZHEPPARAMBIL, KUMARAKOM SOUTH P.O.

8. P.K.PRADEEPAN,S/O. P.K.AMBUJAKSHAN,
PUDUPPARAMBIL, KUMARAKOM NORTH P.O., KOTTAYAM.

9. T.J.JOHN, S/O.T.U.JOSEPH,
THUNDIYIL, KUMARAKOM NORTH P.O., KOTTAYAM.

10. VIDHU BOSE, D/O.K.K.BOSE,
KANIYAMPARAMBIL, KUMARAKOM NORTH P.O.,
KOTTAYAM.

11. K.K.PRABHA, S/O.KUNJAN,
KANNAMKERIL, KUMARAKOM EAST P.O., KOTTAYAM.

BY ADV. SRI.P.V.JAYACHANDRAN

RESPONDENTS: RESPONDENETS/1ST PETITIONER IN O.P.
---

1. THE KERALA AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY, VELLANIKARA, TRICHUR, REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR.

2. THE STATE OF KERALA REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, AGRICULTURE (FARMS) DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

3. THE ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH STATION, KUMARAKOM.

4. BOSCO LUCOSE, NEDIYAPALLIYIL, KMC XVI/74, PANAYAKKAZHUPPUKARA, KOTTAYAM.

R1 BY ADV. SRI.N.D.PREMACHANDRAN, SC, AGRL.UNTY.
R2 BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT. SMITHA BABU

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 10/04/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

K.K.DENESAN & A.K. BASHEER, JJ.

R.P.NO: 33 OF 2007 IN
O.P.NO: 20104 OF 1997

Dated this the 10th April, 2007.

O R D E R

Denesan, J.

Counsel for the review petitioners submits that O.P 20104/97 ought to have been de-linked and ought not to have been disposed of by the common judgment. The basis for making such a contention is that the commission report referred to in the impugned order will not cover the case of these petitioners, because complaints were made about the wrong or irregular selection in respect of two other institutions under the Agricultural University. We have gone through the pleadings in the original petition and the grounds urged therein, in particular. We do not find any material to accept the contention that the commission report has excluded from its purview the institutions where the review petitioners had been working. On the other hand, the commission has entered findings with respect to the entire selection and has recommended that a re-selection is necessary in the interest of justice. That recommendation was accepted by the University. This Court in the common judgment has upheld the order of the University. We find no material or grounds for

allowing this review petition. R.P is hence dismissed.

K.K.DENESAN
Judge

A.K. BASHEER
Judge

jj

K.K.DENESAN & V. RAMKUMAR, JJ.

M.F.A.NO:

JUDGMENT

Dated: